UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/541,999 | 02/28/2006 | Kazuhito Kenmochi | 05391/LH | 6732 |
| FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 Fifth Avenue | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | BRINSON, PATRICK F | |
| 16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3754 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/22/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| | 10/541,999 | KENMOCHI ET AL. | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | Patrick F. Brinson | 3754 | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| Status | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 Se</u> | action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,4,28,29,37-41,50,59 and 63-72 is/ 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28,29,37-41,50,59 and 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | n <u>d 63-72</u> is/are withdrawn from co | onsideration. | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | r | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accelerate and a | epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/13/05. | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | ite | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 13 July 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1, 2 and 4 in the reply filed on 14 September 2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 601,966 to **Ivins**.

The **Ivins** reference discloses a highly dimensional accuracy pipe, as recited in claims 1 and 2. **Ivins** discloses a metal pipe and page 2, col. 1 discloses that the tube may be thicker at one end than at the other or may be thicker or thinner at the ends than at a point or points between the ends, with as many variations as desired in the

Art Unit: 3754

thickness of the walls of the tube and the change in thickness being either gradual or abrupt. The external surface of the tube may be cylindrical or tapered, as desired. Fig. 3 discloses the ends being substantially the same thickness. **Ivins** does not disclose the recited method. The phrase "wherein at least one of a deviation of the outside diameter, the inside diameter and the thickness in the circumferential direction of the pipe as processed is 3% or less, as well as the steps of pushing at least one metal pipe in a hole provided in a die while a plug is being charged in the metal pipe is being treated as a product by process limitation. As set forth in MPEP 2113, product by process claims are NOT limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only to the structure implied by the steps. Once a product appearing to be substantially the same or similar is found, a 35.U.S.C. 102/103 rejection may be made and the burden is shifted to applicant to show an unobvious difference. Thus, even though **Ivins** is silent as to the deviation of the inner or outer diameters and wall thicknesses being 3% or less or the step of providing a die that is at least one of an all-in-one or a fixed type die, it appears that the metal pipe of Ivins would be the same or similar to that claimed, especially since both the Applicant's product and the prior art product are both drawn metal pipes.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,999 Page 4

Art Unit: 3754

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Imamura et al., Stump, Higgin, Katunich et al, Noble, Takashi et al., Ditzel et al., and Sirors are all pertinent to Applicant's invention in disclosing metal drawn tubes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Patrick F. Brinson** whose telephone number is (571) 272-4897. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Kevin P. Shaver** can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,999

Page 5

Art Unit: 3754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-

/Patrick F. Brinson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3754

P. F. Brinson April 17, 2008

272-1000.